DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 900 TE 001 469

By-Fernandez, Thomas L.

A Proposed Course in Oral Interpretation for Prospective Secondary School English Teachers. Interim Report.

Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary English Teachers (ISCPET), Urbana.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-5-0789
Pub Date Jun 69
Contract-OEC-5-10-029
Note-35p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.85
Descriptors-Course Content, Course Descriptions, Course Evaluation, Course Objectives, Course Organization, Effective Teaching, English Education, *English Instruction, Experimental Teaching, *Oral Expression, *Oral Reading, Secondary Education, *Secondary School Teachers, *Teacher Education, Teacher Education Curriculum
Identifiers-Project English

Based on the assumption that skill in oral interpretation is essential to effective teaching of high school English, this study sought to describe a one-term course in oral interpretation that would be most compatible with the needs of the prospective secondary school English teacher. Therefore, a conference of speech and English educators (ISCPET Oral Interpretation Curriculum Study Conference, Monmouth College, Illinois, July 24-28, 1968) was called to consider the development of such a course. The recommendations from this conference included a statement of objectives, suggestions for content, recommendations for methods, and a selected bibliography. The proposed course syllabus was tested at three colleges and universities and found to be suitable for the study of oral interpretation. The recommended course can be either adopted entirely by universities and colleges or partially adapted to existing courses or to individual needs. On the basis of the conference and the use of the syllabus, oral interpretation appears to b e a valuable part of the preparatory curriculum for prospective secondary school English teachers. (See also ED 016 657 for the report of a related study.) (LH)

ED029900

INTERIM REPORT

USOE Project Number HE-145
USOE Contract Number OE-5-10-029
ISCPET Subcontract Number SS-11-18-68

ILLINOIS STATE-WIDE CURRICULUM STUDY CENTER IN THE PREPARATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS (ISCPET)

A PROPOSED COURSE IN ORAL INTERPRETATION FOR PROSPECTIVE SECONDARY SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

Thomas L. Fernandez
Monmouth College
Monmouth, Illinois

June 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and to a subcontract with the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois. Contractors and subcontractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the projects. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office Of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

TE 001 469

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary. 1

Introduction 2

Method 3

Results. 6

Conclusions. 24

Recommendations. 24

Appendix A: Conference Agenda. 26

Appendix B: Discussion Outline 29

Appendix C: Discussion Outline 31

I. SUMMARY

The general problem area treated in this study is that of improving the preparation of secondary school teachers of English. Specifically, the study sought to describe a course in oral interpretation with objectives, content, and method that would be most compatible with the needs of those preparing to teach English in the secondary school. The underlying premise, supported by the evidence compiled in a 1967 report (Thomas L. Fernandez, "An Evaluation of Oral Interpretation As a Part of the Professional Preparation of Secondary School Teachers of English" USOE 5-10-029, ISCPET SS-11-26-67, Monmouth College, Monmouth, Illinois, June 1967), was that skill in oral interpretation is essential to effective teaching of English at the high school level, and that the development of that skill should be an objective of the secondary school English teacher's professional preparation.

Therefore, a conference of speech and English educators was called to consider the development of a one-term course in oral interpretation which would give special attention to the needs of the secondary school teacher of English. Delegates to the study conference were selected from among practicing high school teachers of English, professors of English, and professors of speech. The conferees were charged with the responsibility of defining the objectives of the proposed course of study, recommending content and methods, and assembling bibliography.

II. INTRODUCTION

The subject of this report is the ISCPET Oral Interpretation Curriculum Study Conference conducted at Monmouth College, Monmouth, Illinois, June 24 through June 28, 1968. The purpose of this meeting was to consider the design of a course in oral interpretation primarily intended for those preparing to teach English in the secondary school. A basis for this project had been established in a 1967 study to evaluate the role of oral interpretation in the teaching of English. In this survey, secondary school teachers of English in Illinois testified that oral interpretation is a teaching instrument employed almost daily and skill in oral interpretation, therefore, is essential to their effective teaching. The teachers urged that the development of such skill should be an objective of their professional preparation.

A group of twelve teacher-scholars was selected to make up the working Conference Committee. Six of the delegates represented the field of English and six the field of speech. Three of the delegates were practicing high school teachers; the remainder were college and university professors. The committee met for a period of five days and held both open and closed sessions.

After surveying the general topic of the Conference, the Committee concluded unanimously that while traditional courses in oral interpretation were generally available, a course in oral interpretation oriented

to those preparing to teach English at the high school level was feasible and desirable. For example, such a course could focus more directly upon the literature generally treated in the secondary school; such a course could focus upon the instructional use of oral interpretation in the classroom; and such a course could be used to take fuller advantage of the background in the methods of literary analysis and criticism which upper-division English majors could be expected to bring to the classroom.

III. METHOD

Formal planning for the Conference began in November, 1967, with consideration of the make-up of the working delegation. It was recognized that there must be representatives from both speech and English, and that the representatives should be secondary school teachers as well as college and university professors. Speech must be represented inasmuch as the subject of oral interpretation is traditionally taught in university and college departments of speech. College and university English faculties must be represented because this group directs and most often supervises the preparation of secondary school English teachers. Consideration was also given to the size and nature of institutions from which delegates would be selected. An attempt was made to include representatives from both small and large institutions and from rural and metropolitan areas. There were several additional factors which influenced the selection of delegates. For example, because the 1967

survey was conducted among high school teachers of English in Illinois, English delegates to the conference were limited to that group. Speech representatives were selected upon a broader geographic basis, with primary consideration given to professional specialization in oral interpretation and teacher preparation.

With these criteria for selection, the working Conference Committee was composed of the following persons:

Dr. Wallace Bacon, Professor of Speech
Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

Dr. Allen Bales, Professor of Speech
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama

Mrs. Vernell Doyle, English Instructor
Arlington High School, Arlington Heights, Illinois

Dr. Thomas L. Fernandez, Associate Professor of Speech
Monmouth College, Monmouth, Illinois

Mr. Willard Friederich, Professor of Speech
Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio

Mr. Clarence Hach, Supervisor of English
Evanston Township High School, Evanston, Illinois

Dr. Dorothy Matthews, Assistant Professor of English
University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

Dr. Frances McCurdy, Professor of Speech
Univerity of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri

Dr. R. J. McNamara, Associate Professor of English
Monmouth College, Monmouth, Illinois

Dr. Margaret Neville, Chairman of English
DePaul University, Chicago, Illinois

Mrs. Evelyn Work, English Instructor
Monmouth High School, Monmouth, Illinois

Dr. Elizabeth Worrell, Professor of Speech
Northeast Missouri State College, Kirksville, Missouri

Nine delegates were asked by the conference director to prepare position papers to be presented in the opening sessions of the conference. Two delegates were asked to serve as critic-respondents. The position papers dealt with topics pertinent to the scope of the Conference, and the papers served as a basis for the deliberations of the total delegation. The major topics agreed upon for the Conference were:

1. Objectives of Preparation in Oral Interpretation.
2. Preparing Secondary School Teachers of English in Oral Interpretation.
3. Uses of Oral Interpretation in Teaching English.

A list of the position papers and the official agenda for the Conference are given in Appendix A.

In a further attempt to provide common ground for discussion at the Conference, a preliminary bibliography was compiled and distributed to the several delegates. Moreover, arrangements were made for the delegates to see live demonstrations of oral interpretation techniques. To this end, Professor Willard Friederich of Marietta College presented an experimental reading recital in which he employed a variety of modes of oral performance. Professor

Elizabeth Worrell of Northeast Missouri State College developed a Readers Theatre Workshop utilizing students from Monmouth High School. In addition, the delegates viewed a kinescope produced by the College Entrance Examination Board entitled, "The Speaking Voice and the Teaching of Composition."

Further guidance and direction were given to the Conference deliberations through the use of structured discussion outlines. One of the outlines dealt with the objectives of preparation in oral interpretation. The second outline was concerned with course content and methods. These documents appear as Appendices B and C.

IV. RESULTS

The delegates to the ISCPET Oral Interpretation Conference concluded unanimously that special preparation in oral interpretation for secondary school teachers of English is both feasible and desirable. The delegates agreed, however, that many institutions might find it economically or logistically difficult to provide special courses for the secondary school teacher of English. In such situations the prospective high school teacher should be encouraged to elect a general course in oral interpretation if at all possible. The Committee agreed that the Guidelines for a course of study in oral interpretation could be adapted to the needs of the student who might not be an English major.

Upon completing the five-day Conference at Monmouth College, the Committee endorsed a comprehensive guideline for a course of study in oral interpretation specifically adapted to the student preparing to teach English in the secondary school. The Committee recognized that circumstances might necessitate individual instructor's making adjustments in or adaptations to these Guidelines. The substance of the Committee's recommended Guidelines is as follows:

COURSE GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION IN ORAL INTERPRETATION

PREFACE

The course in oral interpretation herein described is designed as an upper-division course for prospective teachers of English. In addition to this curriculum plan, the committee makes two recommendations: there should be a maximum of twenty (20) students per section of the course; independent study and co-curricular participation should be strongly encouraged. Moreover, the committee wishes to emphasize that their recommendations are not conceived as ultimate or all-inclusive, Individual teachers will undoubtedly wish to make adaptations or amendments. Further, the bibliography prepared by the Conference participants should also be considered as suggestive. Individual teachers will have titles he will want to add.

OBJECTIVES

I. To recognize that a literary work is an act
   The literary work is an act in that it exists as a living presence conveying sounds, movements, ideas, and emotions: it is a <u>felt form.</u>

II. To become aware of the contribution of oral interpretation to literary study
   The student learns how the act of oral interpretation serves the act of literature.

III. To learn the techniques of oral interpretation in the classroom

The student learns to use the techniques of literary analysis for oral interpretation and to make his voice and body an effective instrument for communicating his understanding of the literary work.

IV. To become familiar by practice and observation with modes of oral interpretation suitable for classroom use

While emphasis is placed on practice in individual reading, the student becomes aware of the varied modes of oral interpretation, such as book talks, Readers Theatre, Chamber Theatre, and choral reading.

V. To develop standards for evaluating oral interpretation in the classroom

The student learns to judge his own and others' effectiveness as measured by ability to make the act of interpretation serve the act of literature.

CONTENT

I. <u>The Oral Approach to Literature</u>

A. The student should understand the rationale for the oral approach to literature.

B. Oral interpretation enhances comprehension and appreciation of literature.

C. The oral approach to literature involves translation of the literary text into vocal and physical properties. This translation is dependent on complete comprehension of the text and on the development of a responsive physical and vocal instrument.

II. <u>Literary Analysis Leading to Oral Interpretation</u>

A. Oral performance should be preceded by thorough analysis of the literary text.

B. Analysis of organization and style determines the character of vocal form (quality, pitch, rate, and force).

C. Analysis of point of view or "speaking voice" in the literary work reveals attitude which indicates vocal tone and affects characterization.

D. Imagery may lead to kinesthetic response which may lead to empathy with the literary act.

E. Analysis of prosody, figures of sound, and patterns of scene, summary and description establish vocal rhythm and pace.

F. Awareness of the denotative and connotative value of words in a specific text affects vocal and physical tonality in performance.

G. Making use of such cues as diction, attitudes, syntax, and selectivity of details, the reader projects tensiveness of the text through qualities of voice and body.

III. Vocal and Bodily Techniques for Oral Interpretation

A. Techniques of voice and body are means to the end of oral interpretation of the literary work and not ends in themselves.

B. In respect to production and management of voice, the concern is with breath control, projection, voice placement, resonance, articulation, variety, inflection, stress, and emphasis.

C. In relation to control of body, the concern is with posture, controlled tension and relaxation, facial expression, gesture, and movement.

IV. Communication with the Audience

A. The reader should be sensitive to the needs and interests of his audience.

B. The reader should be aware that selection of materials and preparation of the audience for listening should be appropriate to the grade and ability levels of the listeners. For example, in an average class of ninth

graders stories such as H. S. Harrison's "Miss Hinch" or O. Henry's "The Ransom of Red Chief" might be appropriate choices whereas John Steinbeck's "The Leader of the People" or Wilbur Daniel Steele's "Footfalls" might be more appropriate for an honors class.

V. Evaluation of Oral Performance

A. Evaluation should be based upon the effectiveness of the total performance.

B. The oral performance should be consistent with the internal evidence of the literature.

C. The literary act should emerge as the principal object of the performance.

D. The performance should be properly projected.
1. It should be heard.
2. It should be understood.

E. The performance should have vitality.
1. It should engage the listener.
2. It should elicit a desired response.

VI. Modes of Performance

A. Individual Performance

1. Solo Reading
The performance in which the single reader reads prose, poetry, or drama should receive primary emphasis.

2. Book Talk
The reader stimulates listeners to read a specific book or play by a brief talk that includes reading an excerpt from the work.

3. Book Review
The reader gives a critical synopsis and reads excerpts.

4. Story Telling
The reader retells the story in the spirit of the original narrative.

5. Lecture Recital
The reader combines around a central theme various materials, connecting them by commentary.

B. Group Performance

1. Readers Theatre
Readers Theatre is a group activity involving delineated characters with or without a narrator and with focus placed off-stage.

2. Chamber Theatre
Chamber Theatre stages prose fiction without rewriting the text, keeping the narrative form, and placing the scenes on stage.

3. Choral Reading
Choral reading is an ensemble activity using voices in unison or in antiphonal or solo arrangements.

METHODS

I. A minimum of five prepared readings should be acquired. At least one should be chosen from literature suitable for secondary school reading.

II. Prior to oral performance, a written analysis, paraphrase, or discussion may be required.

III. Written or oral critiques should be offered for each individual performance, These evaluations may be offered by the teacher, the audience, or the reader.

IV. In connection with a major oral performance a term paper may be assigned for the purpose of exploring a subject in depth.

V. While written examinations are recommended in evaluating the student's total accomplishment in the course, the emphasis should be placed on oral proficiency.

VI. It is recommended that the student be introduced to a variety of literary genres, styles, and authors.

VII. Video- or audio-tape recordings may be used for self-evaluation or instructional purposes. Professional recordings, for example, refine critical judgment and broaden the student's awareness of modes of oral interpretation.

VIII. It is strongly recommended that the following teaching aids and instruction materials should be made available.

A. video-tape equipment
B. films
C. kinescopes
D. recordings
E. audio-tape recorders

Selected Bibliography

Bibliographic entries have been categorized into four major reference groups with the category of a particular entry given in parenthesis after the entry itself.

I. Literary Criticism and Analysis

II. Oral Interpretation

III. The Teaching of Literature in the Secondary School
(Items in this category contain information about literature programs in contemporary high schools. They should be used to facilitate special assignments in the interpretation of high school literature.)

IV. Performance Materials
(While many oral interpretation texts contain materials for performance, there are numerous special guides to high school literature which can be consulted.)

Items of bibliography which may relate to more than one specific category are so identified.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aggertt and Bowen. Communicative Reading. 2nd edition. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963. (II.)

2. Aldridge, John W. Critiques and Essays on Modern Fiction. New York: Ronald Press, 1952. (I.)

3. Bacon, Wallace and Robert Breen. Literature as Experience. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959. (I, II.)

4. Bacon, Wallace A. The Art of Interpretation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966. (I, II, IV.)

5. Beloof, Robert. The Performing Voice in Literature. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1966. (I, II, IV.)

6. Blackmur, Richard P. Language as Gesture: Essays in Poetry. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1935. (I.)

7. Booth, Wayne C. The Rhetoric of Fiction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961. (I.)

8. Brooks, Cleanth and Robert Penn Warren. Understanding Fiction. 2nd edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1959. (I, IV.)

9. Brooks, Cleanth and Robert Penn Warren. Understanding Poetry. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1950, (I.)

10. Brooks, Cleanth. The Well Wrought Urn: Studies in the Structure of Poetry. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1947. (I.)

11. Brooks, Keith, Eugene Bahn and La Mont Okey. The Communicative Act of Oral Interpretation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1967. (I, II, IV.)

12. Brown, Stephen and James Meredith. The World of Imagery. New York: Russell and Russell, 1966. (I.)

13. Burton, Dwight and John Simmons. Teaching English in Today's High School. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1965. (III.)

14. Campbell, Paul N. The Speaking and the Speakers of Literature. California: Belmont, 1967. (II.)

15. Carlsen, G. Robert. Books and the Teen-Age Reader. Bantam Press, 1967. Distributed by NCTE. (IV.)

16. Ciardi, John. How Does a Poem Mean? Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1959. (I, IV.)

17. Coger, Leslie Irene and Melvin R. White. Readers Theatre Handbook. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1967. (II, IV.)

18. College Entrance Examination Board. Freedom and Discipline in English. CEEB, 1965.

19. Daiches, David. Critical Approaches to Literature. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1956. (I.)

20. Edwards, Margaret. "Introducing Books to Young Readers," American Library Association Bulletin, Vol. 32, pp. 685-90 (III.)

21. Fernandez, Thomas L. "Oral Interpretation and Secondary Teachers of English," The Speech Teacher, XLIX, (January, 1968), 30-33. (III.)

22. Forster, E. M. Aspects of the Novel. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1954. (I.)

23. Frankenburg, Lloyd. Invitation to Poetry. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1956. (I.)

24. Frye, Northrop. The Educated Imagination. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963. (I, III.)

25. Frye, Northrop. The Well Tempered Critic. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963 (I.)

26. Geiger, Don. The Sound, Sense and Performance of Literature. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1963. (I, II.)

27. Geiger, Don. The Dramatic Impulse in Modern Poetics. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1967. (I, II.)

28. Gillespie, John T. and B. L. Lembo. Juniorplots. New York: Bowker Co., 1967. (III.)

29. Grimes, Wilma and Aleathea Mattingly. Interpretation: Writer-Reader-Audience. San Francisco: Wadsworth, 1961. (II.)

30. Grommon, Alfred, ed., "Preparation in Literature" and "Preparation in Speech," in The Education of Teachers of English, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1963. (III,)

31. Hanna, Geneva R. Books, Young People, and Reading Guidance. New York: Harper and Row. (IV.)

32. Hemphill, George, (ed.). Discussions of Poetry: Rhythm and Sound. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1961. (I.)

33. Hook, J. N. The Teaching of High School English. New York: Ronald Press, 3rd edition. 1965.

34. Langer, Susanne. Feeling and Form. New York: 1953. (I.)

35. Lee, Charlotte. Oral Interpretation. 3rd edition. Boston. Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1965. (I, II, IV.)

36. Literary Cavalcade. A Monthly Scholastic Magazine of Contemporary Literature for Senior High School English Classes. 902 Sylvan Ave., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. (IV.)

37. Loban, Walter, Mildred Ryan and James Squire, "Imaginative Thinking," "Literature: Basic Approaches," and "Literature: Drama and Poetry," in Teaching Language and Literature. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1961. (III.)

38. Miller, James Jr., "Literature in the Revitalized Curriculum," in Bulletin of National Association of Secondary School Principals. (April, 1967), 25-38. (III.)

39. O'Connor, William. Forms of Modern Fiction Bloomington; Indiana University Press, 1959. (I.)

40. Parrish, W. Maxfield, Reading Aloud. 4th edition. New York: Ronald Press. (II.)

41. Proceedings of the Allerton Park Conference on reading in the Teaching of English. Dec. 2-4, 1962. (III.)

42. Riols, Eileen. The Place of the Book Talk. New York Public Library Thesis, 1944. (III.)

43. Rosenblatt, Louise. Literature as Exploration. 2nd edition. New York: Noble and Noble, Inc., 1968. (III.)

44. Sauer, Edwin. "The High School Literature Program Reconsidered" and "The Teacher and the Art of Fiction" in English in the Secondary School, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1961. (III.)

45. Sloan, T. et al. The Oral Study of Literature. New York Random House, 1966. (II.)

46. Sweetkind, Morris. Teaching Poetry in High School. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1964. (III.)

47. Thompson, David W. and Virginia Fredericks. Oral Interpretation of Fiction: A Dramatic Approach. 2nd edition. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1967. (II.)

48. Wellek, Rene and Austin Warren. Theory of Literature. 3rd edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1956. (I.)

49. Wheelwright, Philip. Metaphor and Reality. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1962. (I.)

50. Whitman, Robert. Play Reader's Handbook. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966. (I.)

51. Woolbert, C. and S. Nelson. The Art of Interpretive Speech. New York: Appleton-Centruy-Crofts, 1968. (I, II, IV.)

CONCLUSIONS

In initial planning for the ISCPET study on oral interpretation the study director proposed that if a course guidelines were agreed upon during the summer conference that the guidelines should be tested in the academic year 1968-69. Inasmuch as the course in oral interpretation has been taught traditionally in the department of speech, the speech delegates to the Conference were asked to participate in testing the Guidelines.

When the Conference was concluded and the Guidelines for a course approved, it became apparent that establishing field tests of the Guidelines would prove difficult. Individual delegates to the Conference encountered a variety of administrative problems in attempting to get a pilot course established on short notice. By the time the Conference was concluded, the several delegates recognized that their institutions had already fixed schedules of academic courses for the ensuing year. Teaching assignments had been made. Moreover, it became apparent that in some institutions it would be necessary to receive special approval to teach an experimental course not already in the approved curriculum. As a consequence of these factors, it was not possible to find ideal conditions for field testing the Guidelines.

In an attempt to determine some responses to the Guidelines, however, several steps were taken. At the University of Missouri, the University of Alabama, and Monmouth College, the Guidelines were adapted to the regu-

larly scheduled course in oral interpretation which included both English and non-English majors.

Professor Allen Bales of the University of Alabama reported:

> Since our fundamentals class (Oral Interpretation) is required of all speech majors as well as English majors in Secondary Education, it is not possible to follow the syllabus (Guidelines) exactly as it would be if just English majors were in the class. I have therefore had to tailor the use to these particular classes. Naturally, some of the assignments or units were omitted...I think that this would be the case even in small English majors class. I am not at all sure but what there is too much to get into a semester course.
>
> The student reaction is very favorable, generally. The bibliography is quite useful. The future English teachers have stated that they believe the course will be invaluable to them in teaching...

Professor Frances McCurdy, University of Missouri, reported somewhat similarly:

> Since classes could not be limited to prospective teachers of English, but continued to serve diversified groups of students... the Guidelines developed at Monmouth were modified.
>
> I believe students understood theoretically the first objective: to recognize the work of literature as a form of conveying sounds, movements, ideas and emotions. Recognition of the theory, however, brought improved reading only when other factors such as intelligence, imagination, improved vocal instrument, and practice were involved.
>
> The students did recognize through their presentation in the classroom that oral interpretation made a contribution to literary study. It contributed in several ways. They read widely to find the "right" selection for their assignments. They recognized that the sounds made the literature more interesting and vivid. They enjoyed trying to embody the tones within a particular piece.

Dr. McCurdy reported that video and audio recorders were used to help

students become aware of vocal and body skills. Moreover, she found students had less interest in listening to poems or records than in doing their own reading aloud. Professional recordings were used on a limited basis: sections of one or more recordings were used to illustrate such matters as phrasing and emphasis.

With respect to course content, Dr. McCurdy reported that:

> Students experimented with group reading and several forms of individual oral reading. Book talks and choral reading were not introduced. Group reading was enjoyed but it took more time than was practical for class...The final objective of learning to judge his own and others' effectiveness in making interpretation serve the act of literature was learned to a considerable degree by most students.

Dr. Elizabeth Worrell engaged in a series of discussions with faculty, students, and teaching supervisors at Northeast Missouri State College. These discussions were designed to consider the desirability of the proposed course in oral interpretation for prospective teachers of English. In response to a request for written responses, Dr. Worrell received such statements as the following:

> Loren V. Grissom, Director of Student Teaching and Professor of English Education, Northeast Missouri State College, Kirksville:
>
> One of my earliest impressions had to do with the uniqueness of every student teacher's needs and competencies. However, after two years or so, I became convinced that some factor other than intelligence and general background was influencing the classroom performance of certain student teachers in English. To be sure, the difference was especially noticeable in the literary area, but it also affected performance in other types of lesson. In countless conferences with student teachers, I probed this matter and finally isolated enrollment in oral in-

terpretation as the apparent cause of the important difference described above.

> More specifically, the student teachers who had experienced one or more courses in oral interpretation were more dynamic and more effective in communicating with their students, both verbally and non-verbally...These teachers were clearly more successful in making their students' experience with literature colorful, dramatic, and meaningful.

Terrence L. Moser, Associate Professor of English, Northeast Missouri State College:

> Inherent in all literature is the voice, or voices of the persona telling the story...The most successful way to demonstrate the various inflections of the voice is by allowing it to project itself through a reader as he interprets aloud. Most often when a student fails to understand a work it is because he fails to "hear" the voice of the persona properly. But when he hears the work read aloud, his problem is usually solved, especially if the reader knows how to read, how to interpret orally...In my opinion, oral interpretation of literature is not only valid for the English major, it is wholly necessary.

Frances Walsh, Assistant Professor of English (Children's Literature) Northeast Missouri State College:

> Oral interpretation...provides the necessary continuity between the student's literature study and his professional practice. Its content provides a variety of challenging materials; its conduct offers each student opportunity to explore, to experiment, to select, to organize, and to experience depth experience in problems, techniques, and appreciation. These materials and experiences combine to give the student richer understanding of literature and of the spoken arts, as a source of pleasure to himself, and to the students he will teach.

At Monmouth College, the course Guidelines were used as written for a group of 23 students enrolled in Speech 221, Oral Interpretation. The class was composed of students with a variety of educational objectives, including a group of English majors preparing for teaching certification for the

secondary school. The relatively small enrollment and teaching staff of the college made the structuring of a special section for English majors logistically impossible.

The Guidelines proved very adaptable, however, for both English and non-English majors. Students studied and evaluated the objectives of the course as stated in the guidelines prior to beginning formal classroom exercises. It was concluded that the objectives were sufficiently broad in scope that every student could identify a personal goal within the stipulated objectives. Initial lectures, reading, and classroom discussions were related to the topics "The What Interpretation of Literature?" and "The Oral Interpretation of What?" These exercises related specifically to the first two units of the Guidelines, "The Oral Approach to Literature" and "Literary Analysis Leading to Oral Interpretation."

Particular attention was given to Unit IV of the Guidelines which emphasizes the communicative aspect of the act of interpretation. Students were encouraged to select materials related to the needs and interests of particular audiences.

As part of the course experience each student frequently served as critic for the performances of his fellow students. Critiques were offered in both oral and written form. When written critiques were offered, four or five students responded in order to give a representative sampling of responses. Students also worked in groups with video tapes in order to make improvements in the physical aspects of delivery. Recordings of

professional readers and poets reading their own works were used to supplement the unit on vocal manipulation.

Each student prepared the minimum of five solo readings recommended in the Guidelines. These ranged in length from 5 to 15 minutes and employed both prose and poetry. The initial selections were cuttings prepared from serious essays. Subsequent readings were drawn from narrative prose, poetry, and the drama. The final reading was a lecture-recital of 15-20 minutes. Students were permitted to choose a theme and incorporate the works of several authors and genres, or to focus upon a theme recurrent in the work of one writer. As a spin-off from this exercise, several of the students were asked to give public readings of these programs in conjunction with the celebration of National Library Week.

In addition to the solo readings, selected students developed book reviews. Moreover, the class was divided into groups which dealt with the use of oral interpretation in teaching the short story and choral reading as an exercise in learning poetry. The general enthusiasm of the class was high, particularly when dealing with the group exercises and the lecture recital.

The following statements represent responses of students to the course as they experienced it:

Judith Shauman, Senior English Major

As part of our course work for the oral interpretation class, six students prepared a Readers Theatre program to present the short story "The Death of Red Peril" by Walter Edmonds. This form proved especially effective in vitalizing the story through vocal reinforcement and physical placement of the readers. Six parts were created by dividing the story among four speaking characters and by assigning two readers as narrators. Limited only by their own ingenuity and the physical environment of the classroom, the students were allowed a considerable range of creativity. The presentation led to an active discussion of the story almost as exciting as the presentation itself.

In my opinion, the Readers Theatre form meets two basic needs in teaching literature. First, it provides a variety of approach needed to enhance English classes and thereby offsets the analytical assassination of literature. Second, it brings the students into direct contact with the literature. The student is subtely coerced into an intense scrutiny of the story because he must assimilate it before he can present it. The teacher can step from the center stage position and allow the students to enjoy the literature by participating in it.

Renee Young, Junior English Major.

As a teaching candidate and English major I should like to note that the course in oral interpretation is not required, but was recommended as a beneficial elective to prospective teachers. In my opinion, the oral interpretation course offered experience and training which I feel is extremely important for the success of a secondary school English teacher.

The primary goal of the student reader was to elicit group participation, interest, and understanding, Reaction to and interaction with the oral readings produced and enhanced discussions, which I believe to be of great value in the learning experience. For example, four students were assigned to present book reviews. Two of the reviews were prepared as lectures on the content of the book, while the second two focused upon oral interpretations of passages from the book. The book reviews incorporating oral interpretation were more successful in eliciting positive responses from the classroom audience than those presented as lectures.

Mrs. Joan Maguire, in the process of completing elementary teaching requirements, commented that in the choral reading exercise, "no one need feel left out...even the shy individual can take part." Moreover, Mrs. Maguire pointed out that practicing as a group helps to create a "feeling of working together on something worthwhile and rewarding."

Susan Elizabeth Phillips, Sophomore Speech Major

For one exercise in oral interpretation class, I participated in a choral reading with nine other students. We were given a general objective, but no specific instructions. Proceeding on our own, the group decided to work with two poems by Vachel Lindsay: "Potatoe's Dance" and "The Congo."

In working on these poems our group encountered several problems which provided additional learning experiences. First, we had to ascertain which lines were appropriate for male voices and which for female voices. In addition, we divided the poems into solo parts, parts for two or three voices, and parts for the entire group.

A second problem was in discovering how to blend voices together on cue and in rhythm. This exercise required that we learn to think as one unit rather than as individuals.

As an experiment, we fashioned very simple costumes to reinforce some of the images projected in our presentation of "Potatoe's Dance."

When the exercise was completed, the members of our group agreed that we had not only accomplished something with our reading, but also had discovered the benefits of using group reading to introduce students to poetry.

And finally, a candid observation from a senior student that:

> Another aspect of the course that helps a prospective teacher is the confidence developed as the course goes on. Standing in front of the classroom to read a selection is much like standing in front of a group of students of one's own. They know if the teacher is not confident, and once that happens, it's practically all over.

CONCLUSIONS

The evidence collected in connection with this study indicates conclusively that oral interpretation is a valuable instrument in the teaching of English. While the guidelines for a course of study in oral interpretation designed specifically for secondary school teachers of English have not been extensively tested, it would appear that the guidelines are theoretically sound and practical when employed. Moreover, the guidelines have the virtue of flexibility in that they may be used partially or *in toto* with the expectation of satisfactory results.

Perhaps the most significant conclusion to be drawn from the conference and the findings of the committee is that teachers of English and teachers of speech have a common interest in the development of skills in oral interpretation. The guidelines reflect that common interest and reflect the value of pooling the attitudes, ideas and experiences of the speech specialist and the English specialist to enhance the preparation of future teachers as well as the teaching of English.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Research and investigation into the use of oral interpretation as an instrument in the teaching of English should be continued. There is a particular need to discover what the behavioral aspects of this exercise are and how they function. Oral interpretation is obviously a participatory learning experience. Attempts must be made to deter-

mine more validly whether the student of literature does indeed discover literature more quickly, appreciate literature more intensely, and retain what he has learned more efficiently when he has participated as an oral reader in the act of literature.

A most pressing recommendation is that more students preparing to teach English be introduced to the oral approach and that ways be found to provide post-graduate instruction for those teachers who have not had formal instruction in oral interpretation and who have expressed a need for the ability to use this important technique.

Appendix A

ISCPET ORAL INTERPRETATION CONFERENCE

Monmouth College
Monmouth, Illinois
June 24-28, 1968

Calendar of Events

Monday, June 24

9:00 A.M. . . . . Orientation and Welcome, Student Center
Dr. Duncan Wimpress, President, Monmouth College
Dr. J. N. Hook, Director, Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers

9:30 A.M. . . . . Session I. Objectives of Preparation in Oral Interpretation

Participants

Prof. Wallace Bacon, Northwestern University
"The Act of Literature and the Act of Interpretation."
Prof. Frances McCurdy, University of Missouri
"Oral Interpretation as an Approach to Literature."
Prof. Margaret Neville, DePaul University
"Oral Interpretation as an Aid to the Understanding of Literature."

Critique:
Prof. R. Jeremy McNamara, Monmouth College

12:15 P.M. . . . . Luncheon
2:00 P.M. . . . . Session II. Preparing Secondary Teachers of English in Oral Interpretation

Participants

Prof. W. J. Friederich, Marietta College
"Teaching Techniques of Oral Reading."
Mr. Clarence Hach, Evanston Township High School
"A Supervisor Looks at the Teaching of Literature in High School."
Prof. Elizabeth Worrell, Northeast Missouri State College
"Readers Theatre and the Short Story."

Critique:
Mrs. Evelyn Work, Monmouth High School

7:00 P.M. . . . . Dinner
8:15 P.M. . . . . The Hour of Trial
Prof. W. J. Friederich
Little Theatre

Tuesday, June 25

9:00 A.M. . . . . Session III. Uses of Oral Interpretation in Teaching English

Participants

Prof. Allen Bales, University of Alabama
"Oral Interpretation: An Extension of Literary Study."
Prof. Dorothy Matthews, University of Illinois
"Directing and Motivating the Outside Reading of High School Students."
Mrs. Vernell Doyle, Arlington Heights High School
"Why Read to High School Students?"

12:30 P.M. . . . . Luncheon
2:00 P.M. . . . . Session IV. What should be the objectives of preparation in oral interpretation for those anticipating teaching English at the secondary level?

6:30 P.M. . . . . Dinner-work session. Conclude discussion of objectives.

Wednesday, June 26

9:00 A.M.	Session V. Kinescope: "The Speaking Voice and the Teaching of Composition."
10:00 A.M.	Initiate consideration of outlines and recommendations for proposed course of study.
12:00 P.M.	Luncheon
1:15 P.M.	Working delegates reconvene. Bibliography, methods, and materials.

Thursday, June 27

9:00 A.M.	Session VI. Course Content.
12:00 P.M.	Luncheon
1:30 P.M.	Session VII. Preliminary Course Outline.
6:30 P.M.	Dinner
8:00 P.M.	Readers Theatre Program Dr. Elizabeth Worrell, assisted by Monmouth High School Students.

Friday, June 28

9:00 A.M.	Final Session. Approval of course outline
12:00 P.M.	Luncheon and Adjournment

Appendix B

Discussion Guidelines

Topic: Objectives of Preparation in Oral Interpretation

Question: What should be the nature and objective of preparation in oral interpretation for those anticipating teaching English at the secondary level?

I. What is the nature of the problem?
- A. Do those preparing to teach English at the secondary level have special needs relative to oral interpretation?
  1. What are these needs?
  2. How do these needs differ from those of other secondary teachers?
  3. How do these needs differ from the needs of students who do not anticipate teaching?
- B. What are the secondary school English teacher's objectives in teaching literature?
- C. Do present modes of preparation in oral interpretation meet the needs of those preparing to teach English at the secondary level?
  1. How do they meet the needs?
  2. In what ways are they failing?
  3. Why are they failing?

II. What are some possible solutions to the problem?
- A. Individual tutoring?
- B. Experience in various co- or extra-curricular activities?
- C. Independent study?
- D. Addition of units in oral interpretation to methods courses?
- E. A course in oral interpretation oriented to the needs of teachers of English at the secondary level?

III. What limitations will be, or should be, imposed upon a solution to the problem?
- A. Cost?
  1. Student cost?
  2. Instructional cost?

B. Enrollment?
   1. Numbers of students to be reached.
   2. Background and preparation of students to be taught?
C. Access to and use of teaching aids and other instructional accessories?
D. Time?
E. Does the problem warrant mandatory exposure to the solution? (Should the prescription be required?)
F. Availability of trained instructional staff?

IV. Is a specially oriented course the best general solution?

V. Assuming the answer to IV. is yes, the objective/objectives of this solution should be, for example:
A. To develop the student's oral performance skill?
B. To acquaint the student with methods of oral interpretation which facilitate the understanding and enjoyment of literature?
C. To familiarize the student with modes of oral interpretation?
D. To recognize the oral elements of literature?

Appendix C

Discussion Guidelines

Topic: Content for course in oral interpretation oriented to the needs of those preparing to teach English at the secondary level.

I. Bibliography, method and material.
- A. What nature of materials should be included?
  1. Recommended textbooks?
  2. Articles?
  3 Films?
  4. Video-tape recorder?
  5. Sound tape recorder?
  6. Other teaching aids?
- B. Should materials for interpretative exercises be limited to that which is most often taught at the secondary level?

II. Course content.
- A. Should attention be given to development of voice, diction, and physical action?
  1. How much attention?
  2. What should be the nature of this attention?
- B. Should attention be given to elements of literary criticism?
  1. How much attention?
  2. What should be the nature of this attention?
  3. Would you recommend introducing a wide variety of literary modes, types, and styles?
  4. Would you recommend the "one author" intensified in depth approach?
- C. How much time should be given to oral performance?
  1. What should be the nature of this emphasis?
     a. Readers Theatre?
     b. Solo/recital?
     c. Duet?
     d. Story telling?
     e. Lecture-recital?

2. What mode should be employed to evaluate oral performance?
   a. Oral critiques?
   b. Rating sheets?
   c. Peer group evaluation?
3. What percentage of course grade should be on oral work?

D. What about emphasis on written work?
1. Is the "term paper" a logical focal point for the course?
2. Are written examinations essential?
3. Are written critiques of observed performance essential?

E. What consideration, if any, should be given to communications science and theory?
1. General semantics?
2. Linguistics?
3. Pronunciation?

F. Should attention be given to the history and evolution of oral interpretation?